



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Clearly there are advantages in this method. The ordinary lay reader is no longer repelled by the constant interruption of Greek phrases and the necessity of glancing from text to notes and from notes back to text. He reads an interesting and well-written account of the narrative, as though it were a life of Christ, by a critic of modern views and historical insight. Besides, have we not in Gould and Swete abundant discussion of the philological and textual minutiae? *Per contra*, the method is highly repetitious. When, in addition to text, we are given a free translation, almost a paraphrase, and over and above this comments which make almost a second paraphrase, the question cannot but arise whether the space and type are really economically employed.

Still, let us by all means have the *historical* commentary. There is nothing which can do more to widen the view of the exegete and to restore to the public a taste for the actual reading of commentaries.

BENJ. W. BACON.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn.

DIE BERGPREDIGT (Matth. 5-7; Luk. 6: 20-49) QUELLENKRITISCH UND BEGRIFFSGESCHICHTLICH UNTERSUCHT. Theil I: *Die quellenkritische Untersuchung der Bergpredigt*. Von C. F. G. HEINRICI. Leipzig: Dürr, 1900. Pp. 81. M. 1.60.

DIE BERGPREDIGT NACH MATTHÄUS AUF IHRE ÄUSSERE UND INNERE EINHEIT, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des genuinen Verhältnisses der Seligpreisungen zur ganzen Rede neu untersucht und dargestellt. Von FRIEDRICH GRAWERT. Marburg: Elwert, 1900. Pp. 77. M. 1.20.

THAT there is no first-class work in English dealing with the Sermon on the Mount specifically and exclusively is an indication that theological interest has centered upon the Pauline writings rather than upon the teaching of Jesus. Germany has preceded us in the historical investigation of the Sermon on the Mount. While English and Americans have been content with a translation of Tholuck's commentary on the discourse, published in 1860, the first German edition of which appeared in 1833, a considerable number of books on this subject have been appearing in Germany,¹ and, in addition to

¹ Notably ACHELIS, *Die Bergpredigt*, 1875 (an elaborate commentary of 492 pages, only second in importance to Tholuck's work); FEINE, "Ueber das gegenseitige Verhältniss der Texte der Bergpredigt bei Matthäus und bei Lukas," in *Jahrbücher für*

the special treatises, the recent commentaries on the gospel of Matthew — particularly that of Bernhard Weiss (1898) — have given more attention to this discourse. There can be no question that the Sermon on the Mount is to assume a position of primary importance in the field of biblical interpretation during the next twenty-five years. The two monographs whose titles are here given make a valuable addition to the literature already at hand.

Heinrici's contribution is but half-made, since the present publication gives us only Part I, containing the study of the sources of the material in the sermon; the study of the teaching itself is to follow in Part II. He reaches the conclusion that the Sermon on the Mount does not represent an actual historical discourse, but is instead a literary composition. The evangelist brought together various teachings from the public ministry of Christ, and arranged them into a sort of unity, to produce a "Magna Charta of the true discipleship of Jesus."² In these sayings Jesus appears as the preacher of a better righteousness, showing how the aims and requirements of the law and the prophets are to be understood and realized. He sets himself forth as the reformer of the old covenant, yet his testimony to himself is not exhausted with that; for he goes farther and makes claims for himself, which no one of the Old Testament worthies would have dared to make. The contents of Matt., chaps. 5-7, are gnomes; most of these gnomic utterances, in accordance with the Hebrew "wisdom," are given in concrete, often paradoxical and pregnant, form, with an inimitable clearness, ease, and pithiness. In Luke 6:20-49 we have a discourse which is compiled from similar material and on similar lines, but lacking the distinct local color. The likenesses and the differences of the two accounts give the impression of a common tradition preserved under varying conditions and undergoing various vicissitudes. In Matthew we have the form in which Jesus' words survived among his Palestinian disciples; in Luke, the form in which his sayings were circulated among the gentile Christians.

Strong arguments can be presented to show, against Heinrici, that there was a historical Sermon on the Mount, of which we have similar accounts in these two gospels. It is not unlikely that there is

protestantische Theologie, 1885, pp. 1-85; IBBEKEN, *Die Bergpredigt Jesu*, 2te Aufl., 1890 (pp. 216); HUGO WEISS, *Die Bergpredigt Christi in ihrem organischen Zusammenhange*, 1892 (pp. 111); and STEINMEYER, *Die Rede des Herrn auf dem Berge*, 1885 (pp. 156).

² Similarly WEIZSÄCKER, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, 2te Aufl., 1891, pp. 378 f.

compiled material in these reports, but in both Matthew and Luke we have an actual original nucleus, containing the theme and main development of the sermon. But otherwise one finds Heinrici's discussion highly satisfactory and valuable.

Grawert, however, in his scholarly study, goes to the other extreme and attempts to prove the absolute historical unity of the discourse as given in Matthew. The argument for its integrity is developed on a new line. He holds that the beatitudes as given by Matthew constitute the key to the whole discourse, each beatitude corresponding to a particular section of these chapters and forming its epitome. For this reason the beatitudes must have stood originally, he thinks, at the close of the sermon instead of at the beginning, so that Matt. 5:13-16 was the proper prologue to the discourse (pp. 5-8). The eight beatitudes as they now stand in Matthew are in inverse order as compared with the material of the discourse, thus: 5:10=5:11-16; 5:9=5:17-26; 5:8=5:27-37; 5:7=5:38-48; 5:6=6:1-34; 5:5=7:1, 2; 5:4=7:3-5(6); 5:3=7:7-11 (p. 66). Now, Grawert is certainly right in his view that the beatitudes contain the essential ideas which are expanded and illustrated in the subsequent material of the sermon. But no such absolute connection between the beatitudes and the remaining contents can be shown as shall guarantee that *every verse* of Matt., chaps. 5-7, was a part of the historical discourse. Grawert's analysis, parceling out a number of verses to each beatitude as its epitome, is artificial, and its absurdity becomes manifest when he is forced to make "Blessed are they who mourn" (Matt. 5:4) the epitome of the saying about the mote and the beam (Matt. 7:3-5). Not only this, but he has entirely ignored the phenomena of Luke's parallel account and the distribution of much of Matthew's discourse through chaps. 10-14, 16, of the third gospel. While, therefore, Grawert fails to make good his claim that every verse of Matt., chaps. 5-7, is in its original position, his arguments have great weight against Heinrici's theory of the sermon as a pure compilation accomplished in transmission.

The purpose of the Sermon on the Mount, according to Grawert, was "the consolidation of the disciple-group." By this he means "the inner and outer separation of the disciples from their former Jewish past, and the establishment of their new position on the basis of their relation to the Lord, and in their actual outer connection with him as his followers and future messengers of the kingdom of heaven" (p. 18). But the discourse has a double character, for it also

"indicates the point at which Jesus steps forth from his former reserve with respect to the ever-increasing hostility of the Pharisees and scribes, and engages in open war against them" (p. 18). It was this that made the selection and the union of the disciples a necessity. The occasion of the sermon, as of the appointment of the Twelve with which it was immediately connected, was the daily increasing labors of the Pharisees against Jesus and their persecution of his followers, which called out a public manifesto from Jesus and a positive resistance (p. 33). In this conception which Grawert has of the theme, occasion, and purpose of the sermon there is a great deal of truth, and it might readily be held in conjunction with a mild compilation theory. But one fears that the negative aspect of the discourse has been given too much prominence in Grawert's view; he presses to an extreme the idea of the pharisaic opposition to Jesus and his followers at this stage of the ministry; he postulates a much sharper separation between the Christian and the Jewish adherents than was at this time at all probable; and he does not do justice to the magnificently positive and constructive nature of the sermon as a whole.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

UNTERSUCHUNGEN ÜBER DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES VIERTEN EVANGELIUMS. VON JULIUS GRILL. Theil I. Tübingen: J. Mohr, 1902. Pp. xii + 408. M. 8.

THIS is, in our judgment, the most thorough and valuable contribution to the Johannine problem which has appeared for a decade. The method of approach is the biblico-theological method, that of a study of the origin, history, and kinship of the dominant ideas, which so far, of course, includes no consideration of the external evidence, but is purely interpretative. For this reason even readers who may refuse to consider the question of authorship an open one will find the book of incomparable value; for, while the author makes no secret of his conviction that the place of the gospel is among the anti-Gnostic writings of the time of the Ignatian epistles or later, there can be no question of his learning, the marvelous completeness and range of his reading, and the keenness of his analytical discrimination. These granted, it follows that the effort to trace the genesis and kinship of the great Johannine ideas will be richly rewarded. No mere commentary can compare with such a work for the light thrown upon the book